

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

JENNIFER R. BRITTON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CASE NO. 1:18-cv-39

OPINION & ORDER
[Resolving Doc. [1](#)]

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On January 5, 2018, Plaintiff Jennifer Britton filed a complaint seeking judicial review of Defendant Social Security Commissioner’s decision to deny her Period of Disability, Disability Insurance Benefits, and Supplemental Security Income applications.¹ On December 17, 2018, Magistrate Judge David A. Ruiz recommended that the Court affirm the Commissioner’s final decision.²

Any objections to Magistrate Judge Ruiz’s Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) were originally due by December 31, 2018, but extended to January 30, 2019 due to the government shutdown. Plaintiff Britton stated she will not file objections.³

The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to conduct a *de novo* review only of those portions of an R&R to which the parties have objected.⁴ Absent objection, a

¹ Doc. [1](#). Plaintiff and Defendant file merits briefs. Docs. [12](#), [13](#). Plaintiff replies to Defendant’s brief. Doc. [14](#).

² Doc. [15](#).

³ Doc. [16](#).

⁴ [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#).

Case No. 1:18-cv-39
Gwin, J.

district court may adopt the R&R without review.⁵ Because no party has objected to the R&R, this Court may adopt the R&R without further review. Moreover, having conducted its own review of the record, the Court agrees with the conclusions in the R&R.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Ruiz's R&R, incorporating it fully herein by reference, and **AFFIRMS** the Commissioner's final decision.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 31, 2019

s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

⁵ *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–52 (1985). Failure to timely object may waive a party's right to appeal the district court's order adopting the R&R. *Id.* at 155; *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949–50 (6th Cir. 1981).